

REMARKS

In view of the following remarks, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejections and allow Claims 1, 4-13 and 15-19 the only claims pending and currently under examination in this application.

Formal Matters

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the limitation of Claim 3, which the Examiner indicated is allowable over the cited references. Claims 3 and 14 have been canceled in view of this amendment. Claim 15 has been amended to change its dependency due to the cancellation of Claim 14.

As no new matter has been added by way of these amendments, entry of the amendments by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

The Applicants acknowledge that the Examiner indicated that Claims 3 to 5 and 14 to 16 would be allowable if written in independent form.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

1. Claims 1, 12, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margherita (U.S. patent 4,111,656) in view of Zarling et al. (U.S. patent 5,674,698) and further in view of Hosoi et al. (U.S. Patent 4,541,952).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of the above-cited references fail to make the claimed invention obvious as asserted by the Examiner.

However, solely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitation of Claim 3, which the Examiner indicated is allowable over the cited references. As Claims 12, 18 and 19 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1 they likewise are allowable over the cited references.

The Applicants explicitly retain the right to pursue claims drawn to the broader subject matter in a continuation application.

As such, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

2. Claims 6-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margherita (U.S. patent 4,111,656) in view of Zarling et al. (U.S. patent 5,674,698) and Hosoi et al. (U.S. Patent 4,541,952), and further in view of Schoemaker et al. (U.S. patent 4,837,167).

Claims 6-9 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended.

As such, the Applicants submit that Claims 6-9 likewise are allowable and thus respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

3. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margherita (U.S. patent 4,111,656) in view of Zarling et al. (U.S. patent 5,674,698) and Hosio et al. (U.S. 4,541,952) and further in view of Wohlstadter et al. (U.S. patent 6,207,369).

Claim 11 directly depends from Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended.

As such, the Applicants submit that Claim 11 likewise is allowable and thus respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

4. Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Margherita (U.S. patent 4,111,656) in view of Zarling et al. (U.S. patent 5,674,698) and Hosio et al. (U.S. 4,541,952) and further in view of Schoemaker et al. (U.S. patent 4,837,167; the '167 patent), Pronovost et al. (U.S. patent 5,773,234; the '234 patent) and Wohlstadter et al. (U.S. patent 6,207,369; the '369 patent).

Claims 13 directly depends from Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended.

As such, the Applicants submit that Claim 13 likewise is allowable and thus respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

5. Claims 1, 10 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Velander et al. (U.S. patent 5,328,603) in view of Zarling et al. (U.S. patent 5,674,698) and further in view of Hosio et al. (U.S. 4,541,952).

The Applicants respectfully submit that the teachings of the above-cited references fail to make the claimed invention obvious as asserted by the Examiner.

However, solely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Applicants have amended Claim 1 to include the limitation of Claim 3, which the Examiner indicated is allowable over the cited references. As Claims 10 and 12 directly depend from Claim 1 they likewise are allowable over the cited references.

The Applicants explicitly retain the right to pursue claims drawn to the broader subject matter in a continuation application.

As such, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

6. Claims 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Velander et al. (U.S. patent 5,328,603) in view of Zarling et al. (U.S. patent 5,674,698) and Hosio et al. (U.S. 4,541,952), and further in view of Schoemaker et al. (U.S. patent 4,837,167), Pronovost et al. (U.S. patent 5,773,234) and Wohlstadter et al. (U.S. patent 6,207,369).

Claims 13 and 17 directly or indirectly depend from Claim 1, which the Examiner has indicated is allowable as amended.

As such, the Applicants submit that Claims 13 and 17 likewise are allowable and thus respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the remarks above, this application is considered to be in good and proper form for allowance and the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issuance. If the Examiner finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone Bret Field at (650) 833-7770.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number CLON-060.

Respectfully submitted,

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP

Date: 9-5-07

By: 
David C. Scherer, Ph.D.
Registration No. 56,993

Date: September 5, 2007

By: 
Bret E. Field
Registration No. 37,620

BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP
1900 University Avenue, Suite 200
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
Telephone: (650) 327-3400
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231